In the Drawings:

Applicants enclose a replacement sheet of the figure. No new matter has been added to the drawings.

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 10-12 are allowed. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 13-15 and 17 have been amended. New claim 18 has been added. In light of the following, all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance. If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, then the Examiner is requested to schedule a teleconference with the Applicant's attorney to further the prosecution of the application.

Objection to claims 1, 6, 10 and 13

The Applicant's attorney disagrees with this objection, and respectfully requests the Examiner to provide legal basis for this objection.

Rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 6 and 8 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorecki et al. (US 2003/0108092) in view of Patel et al. (US 6,313,885)

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites first, second and third differential comparator circuits each including first and second output nodes having respective first and second polarities, wherein the first output node of the first differential comparator is coupled to the second output node of the third differential comparator.

For example, referring, *e.g.*, to the sole figure and paragraphs 10- of the present application, first (20), second (40) and third (60) differential comparator circuits each include first (86, 90, 94) and second (84, 88, 92) output nodes having respective first and second polarities, wherein the first output node (86) of the first differential comparator (20) is coupled to the second output node (92) of the third differential comparator (60).

As conceded by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Gorecki does not teach a data slicer comprising differential comparator circuits.

Similarly, Patel does not teach a data slicer comprising differential comparator circuits. In fact, after reviewing Patel in its entirety, the Applicant's attorney is unable to find any mention of differential comparator circuits.

Therefore, the combination of Gorcki and Patel does not satisfy the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 6

Claim 6, as amended, is patentable for reasons similar to those recited above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

Claims 2, 4 and 8

Claims 2, 4 and 8 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 6.

Rejection of claims 5 and 9 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorecki in view of Patel and further in view of Reymond (US 5,517,532)

Claims 5 and 9 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 6.

Rejection of claims 13-14 and 16 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorecki in view of Patel and further in view of Measor et al. (US 5,699,386)

Claim 13

Claim 13, as amended, is patentable for reasons similar to those recited above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

Claims 14 and 16

Claims 14 and 16 are patentable by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 13.

Rejection of claim 17 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorecki in view of Patel and further in view of Measor and Reymond

Claim 17 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 13.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 7 and 15 have been rewritten in independent form. As indicated by the Examiner, these claims are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, then it is respectfully requested that the Examiner schedule a phone interview with the Applicant's attorney at (425) 455-5575.

DATED this 6th day of December, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

J. Mark Han
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 57,898
155-108th Avenue N.E., Ste. 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
(425) 455-5575